



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,689	07/07/2003	Pochun Shih	14337	7419
23676 7590 04/09/2007 SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON PC 225 SOUTH LAKE AVENUE 9TH FLOOR PASADENA, CA 91101			EXAMINER PITARO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/09/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. .	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,689	SHIH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F. Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobal et al ("Kobal", US 2004/0080545).

As per claim 1, Kobal teaches a computer based order management system comprising: (a) a computer having program memory, working memory, and data memory (Figure 1); (b) a graphical user interface operatively connected to the computer (Figure 4a); and (c) the computer being programmed for: (i) displaying an order form comprising a sequence of selection windows for receiving respective specifications of a custom product being ordered by a user of the system, the selection windows displaying specification options as defined by stored product data of the data memory ([0005] and [0018]); and (ii) at least some of the selection windows displaying restricted specification

Art Unit: 2174

options dependent on previously selected specifications, for avoiding selection of inconsistent specifications by the user ([0005] and [0018]).

As per claim 8, Kobal teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the order form further comprises an entry window for receiving a numerical specification element, an associated selection window being selectively disabled depending on comparison of the numerical specification element with a predetermined value ([0026]).

KK As per claim 9, Kobal teaches the system of claim 8, wherein the associated selection window has <sup>ω</sup>set of selection options, a subset only of the selections being disabled in response to entry of the numerical specification element ([0026]).

As per claim 10, Kobal teaches the system of claim 8, wherein the associated selection window has a default setting, the default setting being dependent on user input at the entry window ([0023]).

As per claim 11, Kobal teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the selection windows include a selection button, the computer being further programmed for changing the specification options in another of the selection windows in response to operation of the selection button ([0026]).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 12, Kobal teaches the system of claim 1, wherein one of the selection windows has a default setting, the default setting being dependent on user input at a different selection window ([0023]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-7, 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobal et al ("Kobal", US 2004/0080545) in view of Artinger ("Artinger", US 6,873,958).

As per claim 2, Kobal fails to expressly point out the order form being remote. However, Artinger teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising a network interface for permitting the graphical user interface to be remotely connected to the computer (Column 2 lines 16-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Artinger with the system of Kobal. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a user with unique capabilities above and beyond an individual machine, such as data sharing and communication capabilities.

As per claim 3, Kobal-Artinger teaches a system wherein the graphical user interface is directly connected to the computer, the network interface permitting plural counterparts of the graphical user interface to be operatively connected to the computer for access by multiple users (Artinger, Column 2 lines 16-48).

As per claim 4, Kobal-Artinger teaches a system, wherein the network interface is implemented for communication over a publicly accessible network (Artinger, Column 2 lines 16-48).

As per claim 5, Kobal-Artinger teaches a system, wherein the publicly accessible network is the Internet (Artinger, Column 2 lines 16-47).

As per claim 6, Kobal-Artinger teaches the system of claim 4, wherein the computer is programmed for log-in of users for limiting access to the order form to authorized users (Artinger, Column 6 lines 22-30).

As per claim 7, Kobal-Artinger teaches the system of claim 2, wherein the computer is further programmed for transmitting the specifications ordered by the user to a remote facility for filling the order (Artinger, Column 3 lines 44-51).

As per claim 13, Kobal-Artinger teaches a computer based order management system comprising: (a) a computer having program memory, working memory, and data memory (Kobal, Figure 1); (b) a graphical user interface operatively connected to the computer (Kobal, Figure 4a) (c) a network interface for permitting plural counterparts of the graphical user interface to be remotely connected to the computer for access by multiple users (Artinger, Column 2 lines 16-48); and (d) the computer being programmed for: (i) log-in of users for limiting access to the order form to authorized users (Artinger, Column 6 lines 22-30); (ii) displaying an order form comprising a sequence of selection windows for receiving respective specifications of a custom product being ordered by a user of the system, the selection windows displaying specification options as defined by stored product data of the data memory, at least some of the selection windows displaying restricted specification options dependent on previously selected specifications (Kobal, [0023],[0026]); (iii) the order form further comprising an entry window for receiving a numerical specification element, an associated selection window being selectively disabled depending on comparison of the numerical specification element a predetermined value, for avoiding selection of inconsistent specifications by the user (Kobal, [0023], [0026]); and (iv) transmitting the specifications ordered by the user to a remote facility for filling the order (Artinger, Column 3 lines 44-51).

Claim 14 is similar in scope to that of claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to that of claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to that of claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**



Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Pitaro  
Art unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**